DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 686 HE 013 465

AUTHOR Godard, James M., Ed.
TITLE Black and White Campuses in Urban Areas: Merger or Joint Planning?
INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 58p.
AVAILABLE FROM Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N.W., Atlanta, GA 30313 ($2.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Black Colleges; Black Students; *College Desegregation; College Segregation; Cooperative Planning; Desegregation Effects; Desegregation Methods; *Desegregation Plans; Equal Education; Higher Education; Intercollegiate Cooperation; *Mergers; Program Development; Program Implementation; *Regional Planning; *State Colleges; Urban Universities; Whites; White Students
IDENTIFIERS Armstrong State College GA; Georgia; Norfolk State University VA; Old Dominion University VA; Savannah State College GA; Tennessee; Tennessee State University; Tidewater Community College VA; *United States (South); University of Tennessee; Virginia

ABSTRACT

Three plans implemented during 1979-80 that addressed the presence of historically black and historically white public universities in the same metropolitan areas are described. Plans were developed in Nashville, Tennessee; Norfolk, Virginia; and Savannah, Georgia. In Nashville, Tennessee State University and the University of Tennessee at Nashville merged as a result of a federal court decision. In Savannah, as part of the Georgia desegregation plan, all teacher education instruction moved to Armstrong State College and all business administration courses to Savannah State College. In Norfolk, as part of the updated Virginia State Plan for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, a number of specialized areas of instruction have been assigned exclusively to one or the other institutions, and a number of other instructional fields will be jointly administered, including interinstitutional arrangements between Norfolk State University and Tidewater Community College as well as with Old Dominion University. The rationale for each plan, the procedure by which the plan was developed, and the technique used in the first year of implementation are discussed along with the effects of each plan on the educational process and problems encountered. Observations about planning and implementation that emerged as a result of site visits to the colleges and review of pertinent documents are considered. It is suggested that planning should involve those who are directly engaged in the educational process at the institutions. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED197686

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SREB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Black and White Campuses In Urban Areas

Merger or Joint Planning?

James M. Godard, Editor

HE013465

130 Sixth Street N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313 • 1980 • $2.00

SREB-2

Southern Regional Education Board

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword..... iv

Introduction..... 1

The Merger of Tennessee State University and the University of Tennessee at Nashville..... 7

Savannah State and Armstrong State Colleges..... 27

Norfolk State and Old Dominion Universities..... 41

Observations and Comments..... 53

The Contributors..... 58

FOREWORD

During the 1979-80 academic year, three substantially different plans were put into operation that addressed the presence of historically black and historically white public universities in the same metropolitan areas. The review and modification of institutional roles and missions are important dimensions of state planning to achieve unitary systems of public postsecondary education. Modifying institutional missions is particularly complex when institutions have similar service areas in an urban location.

Plans were developed in Nashville, Tennessee; Norfolk, Virginia; and Savannah, Georgia in response to federal criteria--one as a result of a federal court ruling and the others as a part of updated or revised state plans submitted to and accepted by the Office for Civil Rights of the then Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These pairs of urban campuses are undergoing what is commonly termed "desegregation"--a perhaps misleading term but nonetheless a shorthand expression for the further evolution of a race-neutral system of education that is free of discrimination and open to all who would benefit.

Since there are other metropolitan centers where similar conditions of institutional proximity exist, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) has undertaken case studies of these three widely differing procedures. They are not presented as models. Undoubtedly, other options will appear as state planning continues. However, it seems that an account of these experiences is appropriate at this time.

Both in the planning and the execution of this project, SREB has had the assistance of a number of able consultants who worked with staff. The report is due in substantial measure to their perceptions and hard work.

We wish to express also our deep appreciation of the support provided through a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. These funds were primarily to assist in the cost of the site visits made in the spring of 1980, which will be repeated in the spring of 1981.

Winfred L. Godwin
President

INTRODUCTION

The presence of more than one public institution of postsecondary education in a metropolitan area is not unusual. These multiple campuses are there in response to the goal of providing access to higher education in locations where the population is dense. Frequently, urban areas have both a community college and a senior university, with considerable duplication of offerings for the first two years of college work; but, there are also sites where two public universities exist. Prior to desegregation in the South, it was therefore not uncommon for public colleges for blacks and for whites to be located in proximity to insure postsecondary educational opportunity for all citizens.

Federal guidelines for unitary systems of higher education require that institutional missions be defined in non-ethnic terms, that unnecessary duplication of programs be eliminated, and that the historically black colleges be strengthened. The application of these criteria to situations where black and white institutions are in proximity and have overlapping service areas differs substantially from their application to other public institutions.

Desegregation of postsecondary education also differs from the desegregation of public schools, and the differences are highly visible in metropolitan areas. Neither students nor faculty may be arbitrarily

transferred from one campus to another. What outwardly may seem an unnecessary duplication of programs may actually constitute necessary duplication due to demand, productivity, and internal differences in objectives and forms of instruction.* While in principle there may be a willingness on campuses for desegregation to increase, there are also campus loyalties rooted in past history and apprehensions about future abrupt changes in institutional roles. The primary objective should not be the attainment of specified numerical ratios of ethnic distribution, but rather the modification of institutional roles for the purpose of expanding opportunity and resources for all citizens.

The process is further complicated because of widely differing concepts of the status of historically black institutions within the unitary system. While there is agreement that these institutions should serve all ethnic groups and become a part of the mainstream of public higher education, there is also strong support for their continuing role as a major resource for blacks. What is meant by "the elimination of all vestiges of dualism" through state planning? To what degree must these institutions lose their identity as black colleges and universities? Federal agencies do not seem to have a common stance on this matter, and civil rights leaders hold widely varying positions.

There are three locations in the South where plans for the resolution of

---

*James M. Godard, Educational Factors Related to Federal Guidelines For the Desegregation of Public Postsecondary Education. (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1980), pp. 19-24.

this type of situation have been formulated and were first implemented during the 1979-80 academic year. In Nashville, a federal court decision has led to the merger of the two campuses. In Savannah, as part of the State Desegregation Plan of Georgia, all teacher education instruction has been moved to one campus and all courses in business administration moved to the other. In Norfolk, as part of the updated Virginia State Plan for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, a number of specialized areas of instruction have been assigned exclusively to one or the other institution, and a number of cooperative programs have been projected. These plans from Virginia and Georgia were accepted by the then Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office for Civil Rights.

Each of the three plans is based upon a modification of mission definitions, but the procedures for achieving compliance differ widely. One is based on merger of campuses, one on movement of major divisions of instruction as exclusives for a single campus, and the third on interinstitutional cooperation to offer joint programs and identify a number of specializations in the curricula for assignment to a single campus. While these approaches have in common the objective of further desegregating the campuses, their implementation may have widely differing impacts upon educational objectives and processes.

A final judgment concerning the effectiveness of each of these programs should not be made on the basis of an examination of the first year of their operation. At this point, none can be designated as an unqualified success

or as a failure. Each has its advocates and its skeptics. Information gathered during the site visits to be made during the second year will assist in identifying trends and will indicate which problems visible during the first year are being resolved.

This study is based on the examination of documents which were developed at each location during the planning and implementation processes, on site visits to each location, and on extensive interviews with participants involved in planning for desegregation in higher education. Attention is given to the rationale for each plan, the procedure by which the plan was developed, and the techniques used in its implementation during the first year. The effects each plan had upon the educational processes are delineated; problems encountered, identified; and outcomes, described. Emphasis is also given to the expectations for the years ahead as expressed at each site. No attempt is made to rank the three plans in any manner. A procedure which may be appropriate in one city might not be appropriate in another location. A final section of this report includes comments and suggestions which the site visitors derived from contacts made during their visits.

The site visit to Nashville was conducted by James M. Godard of the SREB staff and Anne S. Pruitt, associate dean of the Graduate School of Ohio State University. The visits to Norfolk and to Savannah were made by Cameron L. Fincher, director of the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia, and Prince E. Wilson, executive assistant to the

president of Atlanta University. Their observations and written materials were used in the preparation of this report, which was edited by James M. Godard with assistance from Cameron Fincher.

Prior to the site visits, the appropriate state higher education agencies were consulted and their assistance was sought in securing background information about the planning process. These officials and the presidents of the institutions provided documents and reports relevant to the study and assisted in setting up time schedules for the visits.

Early in the planning, a meeting was held at which four educators reviewed procedures for the study with those who were to make the site visits. In addition to William C. Brown, director of SREB's Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity, the following were in attendance: Howard J. Jordan, vice chancellor of the Georgia Board of Regents; Paul B. Mohr, academic vice president at Norfolk State University; and John Matlock, currently director of research and planning at the Tennessee Valley Authority Center in Memphis and formerly director of institutional research at Tennessee State University. They were particularly helpful in projecting a design for the interviews.

THE MERGER OF
TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY AND
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT NASHVILLE

Background and Rationale

In 1977, the United States District Court in Nashville ordered the merger of Tennessee State University (TSU) and the University of Tennessee at Nashville (UTN) into a single institution with two campuses. The name of Tennessee State University was to be retained and the merged institution was to be governed by the Board of Regents for State Universities and Community Colleges. On April 13, 1979, the United States Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the decision, and a further appeal to the United States Supreme Court was rejected. As a result, the merger of the two campuses occurred on July 1, 1979.

This court case had a long history which began in 1968 as a class suit filed by Rita Sanders to prevent the University of Tennessee from expanding its downtown campus by building a large permanent structure to house its offerings in Nashville. The defendants included the governor, the University of Tennessee Board of Trustees, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, the State Board of Education, and the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW)--included because part of the funding of the new building was to be provided by that agency. HEW later was excused from the suit and became a plaintiff intervenor. At that time, the court ruled in

favor of the University of Tennessee, primarily on the grounds that the university was offering late afternoon and evening courses for the community and the Nashville branch did not award a baccalaureate degree. The court, however, also stiupulated that the State of Tennessee should dismantle its dual system of public higher education through the development of a statewide plan which would, of course, include Nashville.

The University of Tennessee has its own governing board and has for decades offered off-campus instruction in many parts of the state. In addition to its main campus at Knoxville, the university currently operates the University of Tennessee Center for Health Sciences in Memphis and branch campuses offering baccalaureate degrees in Martin and in Chattanooga.

In 1971, the University of Tennessee at Nashville began to offer baccalaureate degrees. A wide range of service courses, workshops, and seminars was also provided in response to community interests. UTN reported an enrollment for 1978-79 of over 5,000 students all of whom were commuters.

In 1978-79, Tennessee State University reported an enrollment of over 5,000 students, most of whom were full-time and included both commuter and residential students, as well as out-of-state and foreign students. TSU was established in 1912 as a "land-grant institution for Negroes." In that capacity, its service area was statewide. It had been governed by the State Board of Education until the Board of Regents for State Universities and Community Colleges was established in 1972, at which time it became a part of that system.

The student body at TSU has been predominantly black, and the campus of UTN has been predominantly white. UTN had more success in enrolling blacks than TSU had in enrolling whites. A substantial majority of administrative officers and faculty at TSU were black and at UTN were white.

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) serves as a coordinating agency with explicit responsibilities for statewide planning, program review, and budget review. It is not a governing body. During the period when the state was developing a statewide plan for the desegregation of public higher education, a special committee was established to conduct and monitor the study. This committee included representatives from the two governing boards and from the Commission. During this planning period prior to 1977, a statewide plan took shape, and special efforts were made to resolve the Nashville situation where the two institutions duplicated many offerings and seemed to have overlapping missions.

Reports were made periodically over several years to the court, which requested more joint planning between the Nashville institutions. In the judgment of the court, these efforts were not adequate. The court, therefore, ordered the merger in 1977, while at the same time accepting the statewide plan. As part of that decision, the court ordered that planning for the merger was to be conducted by the State Board of Regents of the State University and Community College System, and provided a number of guidelines which were to be followed. The merger was to occur on July 1, 1979.

Planning for the Merger

In 1977, the Board of Regents began planning procedures through which the merger was to be achieved. There was, therefore, a two-year period in which joint committees from the two campuses worked on details for the merger of the campuses. The guidelines and directives that were to be observed provided for employment rights of faculty and staff of both schools, including a procedure for handling grievances; provisions for UTN faculty to participate in the faculty senate and in standing committees of TSU; procedures for combining curriculum and degree requirements of the merged institutions; and they guaranteed that UTN students would have the opportunity to participate in TSU's student government. It was also stipulated that the expanded Tennessee State University should be an urban university, with courses offered 14 hours a day so that community needs previously filled by both campuses would continue.

There was also agreement that, after the merger was completed, there would be an institutional review to determine if the role and scope of the expanded TSU needed to be revised.

The State Board of Regents set up the Implementation Committee to supervise the merger, acting as a subcommittee of the Board of Regents. Four members of the Board of Regents, two blacks and two whites, were appointed as well as one member of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission.

The Advisory Committee was also established as a bi-racial committee appointed by the governor, composed of 10 community and state leaders. Its

function was to make suggestions for accomplishing a satisfactory merger and to interpret the progress of the Implementation Committee to the public.

A staff director was authorized to supervise the day-to-day operation of the planning process and to coordinate the work of the various committees established to handle the details of the merger. The vice chancellor for academic affairs for the Board of Regents, who is black, was appointed. He had previously been a vice president for academic affairs at TSU and, for a brief period, had acted as its president.

The Executive Review Committee was also established, consisting of the president of TSU, the chancellor of UTN, and the staff director. This committee examined the reports of the subcommittees, attempting to reach agreements when necessary, and submitted the reports to the Implementation Committee and to the Board of Regents.

Thirteen subcommittees, composed of persons from both campuses, were set up to accomplish the details of planning. Those that worked on academic questions were arts and sciences; education; nursing; admissions and records; library learning resources; business administration; engineering; academic personnel policies; and continuing education and public services.

The subcommittees to work with administrative questions were data processing and institutional research; physical facilities; fiscal affairs; and security and student affairs.

A timetable for the work of the committees and the subcommittees over the

two-year period was established and followed. All reports were complete and available prior to the date of the merger.

It was agreed that the University of Tennessee in Nashville could continue the operation of its summer school, since plans had already been completed for 1979, but it was understood that the 1980 summer school would be under the direction of the merged Tennessee State University.

The current president of Tennessee State University was named by the chancellor of the Board of Regents as the president of the combined institutions. The highest ranking officer at UTN, the downtown campus, was to be a vice president for public service and continuing education, as these functions were primarily located there.

In addition to appointing other administrators, a number of other decisions were made concerning administration, which included moving the Office of Admissions and Records from Student Affairs to Academic Affairs and providing an executive assistant to the president.

Analysis of the Merger

To merge two previously separate institutions into one has proved difficult. The underlying problems were differences in racial identity, mission and control, and the legacy of a lengthy court battle. The public image of a black institution--its faculty, staff, and students--is often one of inferiority, and many blacks are afraid that any black-white merger will lead to loss of black identity. Employees faced with merger fear for their

own job security. Faculty tend to be oriented toward their organizations, such as the American Association of University Professors and the institution's faculty senate. Students are apprehensive about the availability of courses and likelihood of completing their degrees on schedule. Deans and other administrators must resolve curricular and budgetary issues. Administration is responsible to the Board of Regents, the community, accrediting associations, alumni, and the state legislature to create an efficiently operating, comprehensive university. The Board of Regents is under court order to achieve desegregation. Other institutions under the Board's jurisdiction look to it for fair and equitable treatment. Taken together, these difficulties can be seen as occurring at several levels--departmental, campus community, environmental, and cultural.

Departmental conflict exists where one unit and another of equal status confront or interact with each other. There were a number of units at TSU that had counterparts at UTN. Although they differed in a variety of ways--as will be noted below--in the merged institution they became interdependent. Both were legitimate units of the expanded TSU and, therefore, had to come to terms with each other.

During a two-year period in which joint committees from the two campuses met, they redesigned operations, such as data processing techniques, which would resolve differences in academic accounting. Not only were the calendars for the two campuses different, but one campus employed quarter hours and the other semester hours. There was considerable confusion during the 1979 fall

registration, and some people thought this factor may have precipitated the reduced enrollment at the downtown campus. For the most part, these problems have been resolved. Course credits are now given in semester hours. A computer is used to determine course equivalency figures for work previously taken. The faculty reached agreement on what constituted each academic requirement when one part of the requirement was met in quarter hours and another part in semester hours. All computer services for the two campuses are now centralized. Every course that was being offered at either campus in 1978-79 was still being offered in 1979-80.

Similar modifications had to be made for fiscal management. The confusion at the beginning of the academic year has been resolved for the most part. Timetables for phasing out UTN operations and the transfer of personnel and certain operations to TSU were accomplished. Proposals were developed for such policy matters as budget preparation, student fees, parking fees, and other items for which uniform procedures were needed. Even such items as job descriptions for staff and personnel in non-academic administration had to be evolved. For example, after much debate it was decided to separate building maintenance from long-range planning for physical plant development.

Faculty retention has not been as severe a problem as some people had predicted. The chancellor's report states that 112 of the 121 UTN faculty members had accepted appointments in the merged university. There are differences of opinion concerning how actively some of these people may be seeking positions in other locations, but the impression gained during the interviews

was that in many of the academic departments the merged faculties are adjusting to the change rather well. There is some indication that this condition varies from department to department, especially in the assignment of departmental chairpersons.

The departments differed structurally. There were two sets of faculty members and more than enough administrators. This means that the new Tennessee State University is top-heavy with administrators and has more faculty than will be required if enrollment does not increase.

In some instances departmental goals differed, as in the case of engineering. General engineering was offered at UTN, while TSU's program offered specializations accredited in their respective professions. There was a question about the future of the general engineering program at the downtown campus. It was felt that the University of Tennessee's program in general engineering had been an attempt to provide specializations under that general title. At the time of the visit there was an indication that the general engineering program would be maintained, but serve a different purpose from the specialized programs. Since there is now only one school of engineering, courses may be offered on either campus in any of the fields.

Different goals also characterized the two programs in nursing. UTN was offering an associate degree and TSU a baccalaureate degree. Now the expanded TSU program is offering only a baccalaureate--and is located on the main campus.

There had been some differences of opinion during the planning stage

concerning whether to keep continuing education and public services under the same administration or to separate them. Both activities were particularly involved in programs which served the community as a whole and operated primarily at the UTN downtown campus. Since they do have differing functions, it was decided to separate them. Continuing education instruction is primarily for college credit. The public service role centers more on workshops, seminars, and short-term programs created to meet specific needs expressed by a variety of businesses and organizations. During the SREB site visit there were indications that the two areas of service are being supported by strong leadership and by response from the urban community to utilize these services. At an urban university, both fields are appropriate and hold a strong potential for growth within the merged institution.

Faculty relations in the School of Business Administration involved fewer adjustments, since the dean of that school, who had been dean at the UTN campus, had accepted the joint deanship for both campuses prior to the merger. Faculty on both campuses were, therefore, already working together, and the change was much simpler to handle.

Taken together, the long-run efficiency of the institution depended on its ability to merge or to otherwise make arrangements for all of these equal status units.

Differentiations in formal power and authority create an understandable degree of tensions within the campus community. Tensions exist between such groups as faculty and students, and faculty and administrators. A potential

source of tension was resolved by the prompt completion of administrative appointments and identification of responsibilities.

The creation of one faculty handbook not only produced a set of common guidelines for collegial relations, but regulated relations between faculty and administration. There was considerable interest on the part of faculty in participating in the governance of the institution and in advancing their own rights and responsibilities, while administration was concerned with operating the university efficiently. The Board of Regents exerted pressure to resolve all of this by requiring the creation of a single faculty handbook.

At TSU, tension exists between some of the engineering faculty and the dean of the school. Their grievances were presented to the faculty senate, but due in part to premature publicity of the hearings, the senate was unable to complete its review of the case. The immediate problem was the conflict between the dean and faculty on the development of a policy concerning off-campus employment. The UTN engineering faculty had been able to engage in considerable consultant work, since their teaching duties did not start until four o'clock in the afternoon. As a result of the merger, teaching assignments could begin earlier, which would interfere with outside consultant activities. The new faculty handbook included specific regulations governing outside work by faculty. Several engineering faculty announced that they were not accepting contracts because of their disagreement with the dean on matters of policy.

Tensions also developed between older students, formerly enrolled at UTN, when they came in contact with a few TSU staff members. It is reported that these students resented being treated like the younger 18 and 19 year old TSU students.

What can be classified as environmental confrontation can be expected in merger and is created when an organization comes in contact with external systems that affect its operation.

The new institution is governed by the Board of Regents. TSU receives funds and other forms of support from the Board in its efforts to consummate the merger. The Board, in turn, uses evidences of effective outcomes to justify appropriations. The president is the liaison between the university and the Board. One example of difficulties precipitated by the necessity to deal with the external environment concerns enrollment and its relationship to future budgetary appropriations. Enrollment of students dropped during the first year. Enrollment figures are difficult to secure, in part due to cross-registration by some TSU students who are enrolled in courses at the downtown campus as well as on the main campus. For example, figures provided by THEC indicated that the fall enrollment on the main campus in 1978 was 5,307, and in 1979, 5,755. On the downtown campus the figure for the fall of 1978 was 5,419, and for 1979 was 3,149. The total enrollment on both campuses for 1978 was 10,726; however, when cross-registration was taken into account, the 1979 enrollment was 8,438. It is clear that the drop in enrollment was primarily on the downtown campus.

THEC also provided figures on transfer of students from UTN to other colleges in Tennessee. In 1978, the figure for transfers to private colleges was 44 as compared with 68 in 1979. The number of transfers to other public institutions in Tennessee was 17 in the fall of 1978 and 379 in the fall of 1979.

The University of Tennessee is still an important part of TSU's environment. A year ago there were two problems which loomed ahead that may have been resolved. First was the question of the ownership of the downtown campus and its equipment, which belonged to the University of Tennessee. By act of the legislature just prior to its adjournment in the spring of 1980, the downtown campus was transferred to Tennessee State University. Details of the agreement have yet to be resolved, but apparently the transfer of ownership has been accepted.

The second concern was to what degree the merged institution might become active in programs related to public affairs and services, since the University of Tennessee may continue its role in this regard in the Nashville area. However, as indicated earlier, TSU is moving forward aggressively to develop a wide range of community services and seems to be meeting with a significant degree of success. The University of Tennessee is continuing to provide services in certain fields where it had previously served the community. There is hope at present that both institutions may respond to community needs in ways that do not conflict.

The defining of programs and mission for the merged TSU is inevitably related to the missions of other public postsecondary institutions in middle Tennessee--primarily Volunteer State Community College, Austin Peay State University, and Middle Tennessee State University. Volunteer State Community College wants to serve Nashville and is offering courses at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in the downtown area. A major question to be resolved is the extent to which TSU will offer associate and technical degree programs.

The issue which relates to the two public senior universities near Nashville may center more upon graduate programs. The TSU faculty expressed some doubt that the Board of Regents would be able to resist pressure from these institutions for graduate work and that this situation might impede graduate program development at TSU.

TSU has a working relationship with Vanderbilt University in the field of teacher education through which three faculty members at the doctoral level in Vanderbilt's George Peabody College of Education provide expertise to TSU in directing doctoral dissertations. Because they do not want to be accused of taking students from Peabody College, TSU has agreed not to give transfer credit to any Peabody students who might transfer to TSU.

The attitude of the general community is a critical factor for the future. Several of the persons consulted during the visit believe that the attitude of the Nashville community is gradually changing in regard to the resources which the combined campuses may provide for white students. The movement of the School of Nursing to the main campus of TSU has increased the feasibility

of whites enrolling there. The aggressive role which the administration is taking toward serving the total community, especially in such fields as public service and business administration, is providing some assurance that the urban role of the downtown campus will be maintained.

It is clear that events relating the university to the larger community are not only producing stresses and strains for the merged institutions, but they are to a degree a challenge to its survival and autonomy as well.

Finally, confrontations occur at the cultural level. In the TSU situation, race constitutes a primary cultural difference, for the merger was born out of the court order to desegregate the dual system of higher education. Cultural differences add to an already complex undertaking, mutual misunderstanding, personal bias and discrimination, and institution-based bias and discrimination.

The public image of a black institution is often one of inferiority in all of its aspects. Moreover, although the court ruled in favor of blacks by merging UTN into TSU, some blacks still believe that any black-white merger will eventually lead to a loss of black identity for the merged institution.

The series of meetings held over the two years of planning for the merger, while designed to iron out the myriad details that demanded resolution, served as well to improve the relations between whites and blacks. All of the committees were bi-racial in composition.

A ruling of the court required the newly merged institution to provide positions for administrators and faculty of both campuses, if they wished to remain. When the time came to appoint deans and department heads, the president was careful to assure UTN employees that he wanted them at TSU, and he sincerely wanted the merger to work. He refused to accept their initial declinations of job offers. He asked them to go home and think about it and to give him their decision later. The positions of department heads were vacated, and a search was carried out which welcomed incumbents if they wished to be considered. This process was designed to select the best person for the job, and it helped to overcome personal bias and discrimination. As a result, the Board of Regents appointed a black man to head the expanded TSU, and the top administrative staff is racially mixed. Currently, there is little student racial mix in general education courses; evening classes are primarily white, while daytime and residential students are primarily black. In the area of intercollegiate athletics, TSU is a member of a black conference. The TSU student body, primarily black as far as campus life is concerned, wants to remain in that conference. White students and whites in the community are saying that the university should now play more teams from historically white institutions.

There was tension stemming from cultural differences during the two-year planning period. It is reported that there was a certain amount of holding back on the part of some UTN committee members due to the fact that the case was being appealed, and there was uncertainty as to whether the merger would indeed take place. Other pressures included apathy or even hostility on the

part of some committee members, and peer group pressure on individual committee members. Most of the differences were resolved, however, and all committees completed their assignments. Of considerable importance were the frequent briefings given to faculty, staff, and students so that they would understand the changes which were to occur in the immediate future.

The student newspaper and the student government president have been aggressive in dealing with racial bias. In editorials and speeches, students call for cooperation and mutual respect. Many black students, however, are still pessimistic about the likelihood that TSU will maintain its black identity. They believe there will be "a slow fade to white."

When one examines all of the tasks inherent in merging those two institutions, it is apparent that the major objective was to perform those tasks that would bring about the merger, and that race was not fundamental to such an outcome. Yet the addition of racial differences increased in large measure the problems involved in the task.

Outcomes and Expectations

1. Tennessee State University is now a two-campus institution, both in administrative structure and in operational procedures. This outcome was achieved in large measure through a two-year planning procedure under the direction of the Board of Regents and the work of planning committees representative of the two campuses. Many problems were encountered during the first year of operation, and

many problems remain to be resolved. It is important that the momentum derived during the planning period and the first year of operation be continued.

2. The two campuses have retained their ethnic identities to a large degree. This condition is due in part to firmly established attitudes and in part to the differences in campus missions.

3. There was a significant decline in white enrollment in the former UTN downtown campus. Unless this condition is reversed, the institution will encounter severe problems in fiscal resources and in adjusting to an oversupply of both administrators and faculty.*

4. The university is moving toward the role of an urban university. Continuing education and public services for the community are given high priority. At the same time there are those who wish to preserve TSU's mission as a land-grant institution with an emphasis upon agriculture. The review of the mission of the merged Tennessee State University presents some major problems which will take some time to resolve. It is not

---

* A report on September, 1980, enrollment indicates a drop of 362 white students but an increase in full-time black students. The full-time-equivalent enrollment showed an increase of 81 from last fall.

easy to reconcile these two concepts. The problem is further complicated by the necessity for formulating its mission in the context of the missions of other state institutions of postsecondary education in the service area.

5. TSU has strong programs in engineering, business administration, and nursing, and is mounting a doctoral program in three education specializations. Because of the merger, TSU faces accreditation status reviews by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and by the appropriate professional associations. The administration and faculty believe that the institution will achieve these recognitions.

SAVANNAH STATE AND ARMSTRONG STATE COLLEGES

Background and Rationale

In April of 1977, the State of Georgia was informed that the plan which it had submitted to the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) was not acceptable. In July of that year, HEW released a set of criteria for achieving a satisfactory state plan for the desegregation of public postsecondary education in states which had a history of *de jure* segregation. As a consequence, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia undertook a revision of its plan. Among the matters to be considered was that part of the plan which related to the two institutions in Savannah--Armstrong State College, which is predominantly white, and Savannah State College, which is traditionally black. One section of the HEW criteria calls for the disestablishment of an historical dual system of higher education. Specifically, the plan should assure that students will be attracted to each institution on the basis of educational programs and opportunities, uninhibited by past practices of segregation. The various options suggested by OCR included (1) merger; (2) elimination of program duplication; (3) the creation of separate upper and lower division institutions; and (4) combinations of options to achieve desegregation objectives.

The Georgia Board of Regents sought and received technical assistance

from OCR, conferred with the presidents of its institutions in Savannah, had conferences with knowledgeable people in and out of the state, and held a series of public hearings involving educators and lay citizens. As a result of these and other processes, the Board of Regents and the State of Georgia completed a revision of the statewide plan, which was accepted by HEW in February of 1978. One section of the plan is concerned with the institutions in Savannah.

Savannah State College, founded in 1890, is the oldest traditionally black public college in the University System of Georgia. It is located on 155 acres on two sides of the Placentia Canal in Savannah. The older part of the campus is on the east side of the canal in an area of old live oaks with Spanish moss but is subject to the ravages of a high water table and poor drainage. The newer campus buildings are on the west side of the canal on level grasslands.

The college is coeducational, serving both commuter and residential students. Its faculty and program profile prior to 1979 were those of an institution which stressed teacher education and had a tradition of counseling students so they could achieve higher levels of educational attainment than their entering credentials might have indicated.

Since 1964, the college has offered baccalaureate degrees in business education, elementary and secondary education (13 areas), humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, and technical sciences. Graduate programs in social work and education have been offered, the one in education having been given

cooperatively with Armstrong State College. The typical enrollment in recent years has numbered around 2,500 students.

Armstrong State College is located about 10 miles from Savannah State but on the same eastern side of the city. It was founded in 1935 as a two-year college and was supported by the local community until 1959, when it became a part of the University System of Georgia. In 1964, it achieved four-year status, and in 1971, joined with Savannah State College in the offering of a master's degree in teacher education. The diploma for this degree bore the names of both institutions, and the commencement was a joint ceremony.

Armstrong State College serves commuting students, both full-time and part-time, of varying ages. Classes are offered throughout the day and into the evening. Its typical total enrollment in recent years has been above 3,000 students.

Armstrong State College has had two divisions--a school of arts and sciences and a school of professional studies. Associate degrees have been granted for both general and technical two-year programs, and "2 + 2" transfer agreements in several fields have been developed with other senior colleges. Professional studies have included business administration, criminal justice, dental hygiene, education, nursing, and physical education.

Both institutions have had experience with continuing education, with Armstrong State's support from local student tuition, and with Savannah State

conducting some programs partially supported by federal funds. Both colleges are governed by the Georgia Board of Regents. The Board reviews all requests for funding from the 33 institutions in the university system as well as their requests for offering new programs and degrees.

Development of the Plan

The essential features of the plan as it related to Savannah were determined by the Board of Regents after assessing several countervailing ideas, plans, and pressures that developed both in Savannah and in Atlanta, the state's capitol. Several special interest groups exerted a great amount of pressure at various times and various places and in various forms. The news media sometimes released premature information about these developments. Committees of the faculties of both institutions met and discussed the several options available to the state.

For example, a "Savannah State College Desegregation Committee" published A Plan for the Desegregation of Savannah State College in June, 1978, calling for Savannah State to operate solely all academic programs which it had in 1964, before Armstrong State became a four-year institution. It also called for the addition of several new academic programs to enhance the image of the college.

During the decision-making period, the option of merging the two campuses was given consideration. Three community meetings were held in downtown Savannah. Businessmen reportedly concluded that a merger would be economically

disadvantageous to the city. State legislators who made public appearances in Savannah also rejected merger as a viable option. During meetings on each of the campuses the issue of merger was raised. Administrators, alumni, and students had divergent views. Organized student demonstrations on the Savannah State campus were incorrectly believed to be focused on the concern of merger; they were in fact a reaction against the administration's recent enforcement of dormitory and academic regulations.

During this period the presidents of the two colleges maintained continuing and effective communication between themselves so that they avoided presenting conflicting statements and views. In addition, they met with each other's students and faculty.

After assessing the information which they had, the Board of Regents made the decision not to merge the institutions, but instead, (1) to reduce program duplication by assigning each of the two largest educational programs to only one campus, and (2) to enhance the program options at Savannah State.

The first step involved modification of institutional missions of both institutions. All work in teacher education was assigned exclusively to Armstrong State. All courses in business administration were assigned to Savannah State. These actions were designed by the Board of Regents "to assure the preservation of institutional identity while at the same time promising substantial change in the institutional racial characteristics."

New programs to enhance the offerings at Savannah State included marine

biology, environmental studies, aeronautical engineering, and the upgrading of computer technology. In addition, it was agreed that a Continuing Education Center would be established in downtown Savannah with a director who would report to the presidents of the two institutions and with a budget supervised for two years by Savannah State and then two years by Armstrong State.

The plan provided that faculty who would be moved to the other campus where their programs would be housed would retain all faculty benefits of tenure, salary, and rank. Additional provisions in the plan projected the construction and renovations of buildings, grounds, and physical facilities at Savannah State and the establishment of a Regents' scholarship fund to support the desegregation objectives of the plan.

College administrators were charged with the responsibility for implementation of the plan after it had been accepted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Analysis of the Merger

Adjustments in the administration of the campuses were necessary as the plan was implemented. The effective communication between the two presidents, established during the planning period, continued as steps were taken to bring about the many changes in the operation of the institutions. Two problems were faced. First, the fact that the president of Savannah State was an acting president during a period when long-range decisions had to be

made added to the complexity of the process. Second, a dean for the division of business administration at Savannah State was not appointed, since the acting president believed that this decision should be made by the new president when he took office, which resulted in some disunity among faculty and students in their day-to-day dealings.

The Center for Continuing Education during the first year of the joint operation did not yet have an administrative structure adapted to the concept of a cooperative venture. The director reports to both presidents, with satellite coordinators located on each campus. While faculty believe there there is a significant potential for community service through the Center, they hope that an internal administrative operation based on stated policies will soon emerge. For example, some part-time faculty teaching in the Center did not know to which institutional faculty they belonged. Several faculty expressed the belief that the Board of Regents' office in Atlanta may have to provide staff assistance in the development of appropriate administrative operations.

The faculty initially experienced the anxieties that normally arise from unstructured participation in what seemed to be an amorphous process. However, the Regents' decision to honor length of faculty service, salary scale, tenure, leave, and related matters eased the situation and facilitated faculty transfers from one campus to another. Racial feelings in some instances made these transfers awkward. All Savannah State faculty who were to move to the Armstrong campus did so, and it was reported that all but two Armstrong faculty made their transfer to Savannah State.

Problems arising in relation to faculty transfer did occur out of differences in campus traditions and in educational philosophies. At Savannah State, faculty had been accustomed to a nine-to-five workday, but at Armstrong State class assignments often extended into the evening hours. The fundamental tension was rooted in contrasting philosophies and emphases in instruction--the focus at Armstrong State had been on the liberal arts with traditional classroom instruction; at Savannah State there was major concern for teacher education and for the remediation of students who lacked competencies, with a prime emphasis on counseling, both personal and instructional.

Some faculty members also had difficulty in changing from teaching residential students to commuter students of widely varying ages. At Savannah State it had been possible to meet with individual students to provide special assistance in their studies, but the commuter student at Armstrong State tended to leave the campus after classes had ended for the day.

Concern was expressed by the faculty on both campuses that library and other instructional resources had not been transferred to the other campus to which faculty had been moved. The teacher education materials are still centered at Savannah State, and the business administration resources are still at Armstrong State.

There has not yet been an assessment of the effect transferring programs has had on enrollments in disciplines which are related to teacher education and to business administration. For example, instruction in training teachers in the field of business administration called for taking major courses on one

campus and teacher education courses on the other campus. During the year, a decision was finally made to center business education at Savannah State but for it to operate as a joint cooperative program.

A more subtle problem related to training public school teachers is becoming evident. Persons preparing for high school teaching certificates enroll in many courses outside of teacher education--for example, a student training to be an English teacher takes numerous courses in that discipline, and the same applies to other high school teaching fields, such as social and natural sciences. The movement of teacher education from a campus thus has consequences on class enrollments in many subject-matter areas.

The effects of the changes upon students can be more definitively assessed during the second year of the plan's operation. During the first year there was only limited evidence of the willingness of students to participate in the desegregation plan.

A class suit had been filed in the United States Fifth Circuit Court against the implementation of the plan and called for a type of desegregation which might lead to merger. Students at Savannah State had been leaders in this effort. The court refused to delay the implementation of the plan but agreed to hear the case. The existence of this suit has to some degree made the implementation of the plan more difficult.

Positive factors which aided students in the transition were efforts to facilitate student financial aid applications and registration procedures,

particularly for black students who enrolled in courses at Armstrong State, and the prior presence of "other race" students on both campuses. Student organizations and athletics also played a role in providing a bridge for new and transfer students to cross. There were still some factors which had a negative effect--charges of racism by students and faculty, inadequate bus service between campuses, unused dormitory space, and unfunded new academic programs.

At the time of the site visit in the spring of 1980, definitive information on enrollment changes by race was difficult to secure, but there is agreement that enrollment decreased on both campuses. Armstrong State had an increase in full-time-equivalent enrollment but a decline in head count, implying a decline in part-time enrollment. The drop in combined enrollment in the division of business administration from 1978-79 to 1979-80 on both campuses may have amounted to 400 students. As one administrator expressed it, some students "voted with their feet" against the plan. On the other hand, Armstrong State's share of minority students increased from 12 percent to 18 percent. While a substantial number of white students transferred to Savannah State to complete their work in business administration, it is reported that no new white students enrolled in the freshman class for this purpose.

Tensions related to the larger community and the surrounding region are present but not acute. Previous cooperation between the two institutions over a period of years had accustomed the community to the concept of

coordinating programs offered on each campus. On the other hand, there is an indication that the community may believe that the final outcome has not yet been defined. The existence of the federal court case suggests the possibility that the plan may be modified. The movement of faculty and students between campuses is accepted, but there is doubt that white residential students will enroll at Savannah State for some time to come. While the community seems to have opposed merger, there are some faculty and administrators of both races who express their belief that, in the long run, merger might work better than the present plan. There are others who disagree.

There is a belief that numbers of white students in Savannah may decide to attend other institutions outside of but near Savannah, particularly Georgia Southern College at Statesboro. At the same time, other public institutions in south Georgia are concerned about the possible effect of program review on their own offerings.

Tensions arising from cultural factors, and in particular from ethnic factors, exist but are not critical. It is reported that white students have become more willing than in the past to come to the Savannah State campus for courses and that they have been pleasantly surprised at the quality of teaching they receive. Student leaders on both campuses have exercised leadership in promoting racial understanding and cooperation. When minor incidents have occurred, they have been defused promptly. The administration of both campuses had made it clear that racial disturbances would not be tolerated, and there were no serious confrontations of this nature.

Outcomes and Expectations

The movement of a comprehensive instructional program from one campus to another is a complex process. The transition was, however, accomplished and operational during the first year of implementation. These observations were derived from the site visit:

1. It was agreed that the transfer of credits for students previously enrolled on the campuses should be made as simple as possible. Students who were close to graduating at one institution or the other could receive the degree from the original institution through August, 1980, although taking courses on the "other campus." Transfers of credit hours were made easy and were accepted without contention on both campuses.
2. The enrollment decline is regarded as a serious problem, and additional recruiting efforts were planned for the 1980-81 year.
3. Faculty transfer to the other campus was accomplished, but not without some problems. These were rooted not so much in differences of stated mission as in basic concepts of what a college should be for its students.
4. The improvements of the physical campus at Savannah State were initiated and have already had a positive effect upon morale.
5. The faculty in teacher education who transferred to Armstrong State feel strongly that Armstrong State must seek national professional accreditation of the teacher education program.

6. The faculty are supportive of the Center for Continuing Education, but they believe that the Center must have a more effective administrative structure.

7. The new courses projected to be offered by Savannah State in marine biology, chemical engineering and technology, aeronautical engineering, and environmental studies were not yet in place. Faculty personnel seem to be in support of the new courses. They have doubts that adequate funds for them are yet available, and they are hopeful that these programs will receive priority and technical support for their implementation.

8. There is an expectation that the two campuses in Savannah will increasingly work together. There is an expectation also that the implementation of the plan will proceed more rapidly and efficiently now that Savannah State College has a new president and an administrative head of the division of business administration.

NORFOLK STATE AND OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITIES

Background and Rationale

Norfolk State University (NSU), founded in 1935, is the youngest of Virginia's five historically black institutions, two of which are public and three private. Norfolk State is organized into nine schools with 31 departments of instruction and offers master's degrees in seven areas, baccalaureates in 50 major fields, and associate degrees in 10 fields. The institution began as a unit of Virginia Union University and was a two-year college in its early years. It operated under several organizational arrangements before becoming Norfolk State College in 1969 and Norfolk State University in 1979. Student enrollment is approximately 7,000.

The institution is located in Norfolk, the largest city in Virginia, and serves the larger region known as the Tidewater area. It is close to major installations of U. S. military services and has been responsive to its location in a large urban setting in a coastal subregion of the state.

Norfolk State offers the following academic programs: business administration, teacher education, home economics, humanities, science and mathematics, social sciences, industrial education and technology, nursing education, and continuing education. The graduate division provides instruction at the master's degree level in communications, community and clinical psychology, and urban affairs.

Physically, Norfolk State is located on 105 acres of land east of downtown Norfolk. Extensive improvements are currently underway. At the moment, the library is regarded as the most outstanding structure on the campus.

Old Dominion University (OD) is now 50 years old, having begun in 1930 as the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary. In 1954, the institution was authorized to offer baccalaureate degrees, and in 1962, it was separated from the College of William and Mary to become Old Dominion College. In 1968, the name was officially changed to Old Dominion University. Student enrollment is approximately 14,000.

Old Dominion is organized into eight schools: business administration; education; engineering; graduate studies; arts and letters; sciences and health professions; general studies; and continuing studies. The institution has been authorized to grant master's degrees since 1964. In 1971, the doctor of philosophy degree in engineering was approved, and in 1973, a doctoral degree in oceanography was approved. In addition to 36 master's programs, the institution offers certificates of advanced study in educational administration and counseling. Several doctoral programs are available in education.

Old Dominion occupies 120 acres between the Lafayette and Elizabeth rivers and is four miles from Norfolk State. The institution has a 10-year plan that calls for the campus to nearly double in size. Old Dominion's recent development is reflected in several endowed professorships, its

educational and research foundations, its intercollegiate foundation, and its Center for Urban Research and Service.

Norfolk State University and Old Dominion University are each governed directly by separate Boards of Visitors with statutory authority. The State Board for Community Colleges is responsible for the public junior colleges under the coordination of the State Council. The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia reviews all requests for state funds and program additions or modifications. At the state level, the two institutions are governed indirectly by the General Assembly and by the governor and the secretary of education in the executive branch of state government. The statutory office of the secretary of education was established in 1972. The State of Virginia operates on a biennial budget and the General Assembly is responsible for appropriations to higher education. As a part of the state's agreement with the Office for Civil Rights (OCR), almost $900,000 was appropriated in 1979 to implement the Virginia Plan for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. In 1979, the State Plan for Higher Education, developed by the State Council, was updated.

The State Council of Higher Education has statutory responsibility for planning and coordination. The Council is responsible for budget guidelines and formula, and it reviews all institutional budgets with recommendations to the General Assembly.

The State Council of Higher Education serves also as the state's 1202

Commission, as the state's student assistance agency, and as its licensing and approval agency for private degree-granting institutions.

Neither merger nor the movement of major divisions of instruction were given serious consideration as the procedures for resolving duplication of programs in Norfolk. Instead, it was decided to develop a plan through which a number of specialized fields of instruction would be located at one or the other campus, and a number of other instructional fields would become jointly administered programs, including interinstitutional arrangements between Norfolk State and Tidewater Community College as well as with Old Dominion. In addition, Norfolk State University would be enhanced through the assignment of a number of new instructional programs.

A modest beginning in interinstitutional cooperation had already been initiated between Old Dominion and Norfolk State. Several years ago a two-year project had been operated through which senior students of both institutions who were engaged in student teaching in the Norfolk public schools met in jointly operated seminars through which their experiences in student teaching were analyzed. This project was successful and resulted in continuing contacts between the teacher education faculties of the two institutions.*

---

* J.S. Anzalone, Expanding Opportunities: Case Studies of Interinstitutional Cooperation, 1973. (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1973), p. 35.

The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia had also approved procedures through which cooperative programs might be designated as "joint" programs and others designed as "cooperative" programs in which one institution was recognized as "the lead institution." This terminology is still in effect.

The definition of the respective roles in the city of Norfolk of Norfolk State and of Tidewater Community College had been a matter of concern for some time, and it was decided to include these relationships in the review of duplication in the Tidewater area.

Table I provides in outline form a listing of the modifications of programs which are to be accomplished. In addition to these developments, a number of new programs were identified for future addition to the offerings of Norfolk State University. It is understood that these programs will be added over a period of time to provide additional strength to the university's academic resources. These new offerings include: home economics education, health services administration, personnel and industrial relations, medical records administration, child care and family studies, urban planning, and medical social work.

The Development of the Norfolk Plan

The interinstitutional agreement between Norfolk State and Old Dominion was reached after a period of trial-and-error in developing acceptable procedures for reaching agreement. Progress appears to have been made swiftly

TABLE I. MAJOR FEATURES OF THE NORFOLK PLAN

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS	CHANGES TO BE IMPLEMENTED
Business	Business education eliminated at Old Dominion; Norfolk State to offer the only program in Tidewater area. General business administration program eliminated at Old Dominion with development of specialties at Norfolk State in such fields as accounting. Norfolk State to seek accreditation by American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business and to develop a master's degree in business.
Education	Elimination of early childhood education at Old Dominion and of elementary education (grades 4-7) at Norfolk State. Dual certification permissible if second field is taken at the other institution. Assistance in staffing at Norfolk State if requested.
Education of the Mentally Retarded	Development of a comprehensive program between Norfolk State and Old Dominion with special courses to be taught on each campus. Students must take 50 percent of courses at the other institution.
Health Education	Cooperative program between Norfolk State and Old Dominion with upper division courses evenly divided.
Accounting	Specialization of program content with articulation between Norfolk State and Tidewater Community College (2 + 2 transfer program).
Office Administration	Development of 2 + 2 transfer program between Norfolk State and Tidewater Community College.
Secretarial Studies	Development of 2 + 2 transfer program between Norfolk State and Tidewater Community College, with maintenance of specialized emphases at Norfolk State and Old Dominion.
Speech Correction	Maintenance of specialization at Norfolk State and Old Dominion. Programs will continue to serve different purposes.
Medical Technology	No changes implemented because of limited access and high demand. Programs at both Norfolk State and Old Dominion to be continued.

when it was decided, either tacitly or otherwise, that the institutions themselves would work out the operational details. The presidents and their top administrators were evidently the most influential decision-makers during the negotiations. Both presidents were relatively new to their respective posts and had few ties to institutional traditions or campus factions.

The presidents of the two institutions were charged by their respective boards to develop and recommend plans for interinstitutional cooperation.

Many features of the plan that bear directly upon Norfolk State and Old Dominion have been influenced by the Tidewater Duplication Study (1978) which was submitted to OCR for review in 1978. The Tidewater Duplication Study was authorized by the governor and directed by the secretary of education. The study included Christopher Newport, Thomas Nelson, and Tidewater Community Colleges, as well as Norfolk State and Old Dominion. Nine programs were identified at that time as unnecessarily duplicative between Norfolk State and Old Dominion. The Boards of Visitors for Norfolk State and Old Dominion were also authorized to review the evidence and to make recommendations for state compliance.

The procedures employed in Norfolk differ from those utilized in Savannah in the degree of responsibility placed upon the institutions to reach agreements on program assignments. It was agreed by the presidents that broad, active participation was necessary and that this participation must include those who were directly concerned with the affected academic programs.

Channels for interinstitutional communications were established, and specific individuals at the two institutions were identified as liaisons.

Communications were kept open at all times with governing boards, state government agencies, and the general public. Both presidents appeared on television and in press interviews jointly to avoid any semblance of antagonism. A November 1978 press conference in Richmond seemed to have been particularly helpful in identifying critical questions.

Negotiations with federal representatives in OCR were conducted by the two presidents themselves. It was believed that negotiations were facilitated when legal representatives stepped aside and permitted educators to deal directly with federal authorities. Negotiations were also improved by the adoption of lines of argument that were regarded as educationally sound. During the negotiation period the importance of timing in publicity and the significance of public relations were recognized and followed. Public confidence in the deliberative process was necessary, and a strong effort was made to maintain this attitude in critical deliberations.

In brief, the specific factors or conditions which promoted reaching an agreement were:

1. Public support for institutional planning at the local level was strong.
2. The "problem" was delegated to presidents by chairmen of the two Boards.
3. Presidents were free to confer with Washington officials as often as they believed necessary.

4. The decision was made not to involve lawyers in the educational negotiations with Washington agencies.

5. The decision was made to involve faculty as well as academic administrators in the planning.

6. After initial conflict between lawyers and educators, the faculty negotiations settled down to deliberations between educators. The vice-presidents for academic affairs were included in these negotiations.

7. Inter-campus buses and registration and scheduling cooperation preceded the campus visit of OCR in the deliberations and helped set the stage for later negotiations.

8. Arguments for enhancement of Norfolk State were not presented as arguments to the detriment of Old Dominion.

Outcomes and Expectations

While the concept of expanding opportunity for students through the sharing of faculty resources between institutions is commonly accepted, the actual development of specific interinstitutional agreements is often a delicate and complicated process. In an SREB review of cooperative arrangements between historically black and historically white institutions benefits to be derived were identified--such as expanded access to a variety of programs and more productive use of funds. However, 13 negative factors were defined--such as fear by academic departments that their roles will be weakened and the difficulty of avoiding a "big brother" approach.* The outcomes of the Norfolk plan will depend in large measure upon the degree to

*Southern Regional Education Board, Expanding Opportunity Through Sharing Faculty Resources, (Atlanta: SREB, 1975), pp. 4-8.

which the positive aspects can be maximized and the negative factors minimized over a period of years.

Both of the universities give evidence of wanting the agreements to become firmly established and operative. To a degree, the motivation arises from the desire to maintain campus identity instead of moving into a merger. The Boards of Visitors and the top administrators have made a strong commitment in support of the agreements. The overall attitude of the faculty at this stage seems to be one of willingness to abide by the institutional decisions, but with some pockets of skepticism about either the wisdom of the plan or its prospects for the immediate future. The faculty are no doubt sensitive to issues that must yet be resolved. Nevertheless, departmental ambitions will continue to be a factor as the agreements are fully implemented.

The effects of interinstitutional cooperation on the students at both campuses are described as both direct and subtle. Representatives of the Student Government Associations report many efforts to cooperate in organized student activities as well as in academic activities in courses where there is joint enrollment. Reports are that racial friction is apparently minimal.

One of the immediate outcomes is the cooperation between Norfolk State and Tidewater Community College in their 2 + 2 programs. This development is a significant departure from past history.

There is some concern over whether the Office for Civil Rights has fully

accepted the plan as adequate for eliminating unnecessary duplication. The amount of actual movement of students between campuses during 1980-81 will doubtless be regarded as an indication of the effect of the plan upon ethnic mixtures.

Another question has been raised about the adequacy of financial support for the plan. Even though the Virginia General Assembly allocated funds for implementation, many of the costs are hidden and may not be immediately assessable.

The addition of the projected new courses for Norfolk State will depend upon future enrollments and demonstrated need for and interest in these courses.

There is also an expectancy that the program will increase the possibility of cooperation in academic areas not now affected by the Virginia plan. Learning to meet "face-to-face" is regarded as one of the most beneficial aspects of the planning process because it has permitted the respective faculties to discuss educational matters of mutual interest.

An expectation expressed by Norfolk State administrators is that the plan will enable that institution to become more visible in the provision of community services. Their hope is that this development will become a means of improving the image of the institution in the Tidewater area.

Finally, there is a recognition on both campuses that interest in joint programming may wane as time passes. This condition has often been observed among consortia arrangements. It constitutes perhaps the major threat to the long-term success of the plan.

OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Rapid changes in interinstitutional relations can be a traumatic experience. This is especially likely when the forces requiring extensive changes are both external and internal.

The three plans for interinstitutional relations discussed in this report have many differences. Each has its own pattern of impacts upon the roles of administrators, faculty members, and students. Each has features which are unique, even though the problems being confronted have much in common.

During the on-site interviews, administrative, faculty, and student participants were asked to comment on the effectiveness both of the planning and of the procedures for implementation. They were asked if programs had operated as expected and what difficulties may have interfered with the attainment of the objectives. From these comments and from the documents reviewed at each location the following observations emerged. They are presented with the explicit hope that they may be of service to participants in similar planning procedures in the near future.

Even though the plans were quite different, the following features are common to all of them:

+ modification of institutional missions;
+ changes in administrative roles and responsibilities;

+ changes in academic structure and operation;

+ changes in some faculty roles;

+ modifications in student life-styles;

+ concerns expressed by the larger community.

A number of observations about both planning and implementation emerged as the site visitors reviewed their experiences in the three locations. While they stem from these particular situations, these rules of thumb may prove useful in other cases and for other options which might be chosen for inter-institutional programming.

The first step is the establishment of a sound and acceptable planning process. The adoption of interinstitutional plans should be based on a careful consideration of options, including a careful weighing of advantages and disadvantages to those options. A sound rationale should be developed for supporting the plan which is selected so that persons who may have preferred an alternate method for meeting desegregation requirements will understand the reasons that led to the selection which was adopted.

After a plan has been approved by the appropriate authorities and supported by a firm commitment to its implementation, the next step is the design of procedures for effecting the changes required for each component of the plan. It is important that administrators and faculty of the two institutions become jointly involved in this process. Experience suggests that the goals and objectives to be achieved be identified before projecting the series of detailed steps which will have to be taken to implement the modified programs. If the

process is goal-oriented, there will be less defensiveness and concern over individual security and roles in the new arrangements.

The mechanics of change will unfold more clearly when the end-product is defined. For example, if a commitment is made to combine two schools of nursing, the next step is to delineate the type of nursing school which will be the outcome. What degree will be awarded? What specialties will be offered? What admissions requirements should be established? After these and other objectives are defined, the specific steps which must be taken may be designed, such as courses to be offered, on which campuses courses will be given, resources needed, and the assignment of faculty responsibilities.

In most cases, if this process is followed, the outcomes should and will provide greater strength and expanded services for both campuses. However, while potentials for disruption of the educational process are present under circumstances such as these, often these potentials may be identified and actions taken in advance to defuse them or lessen their force.

To summarize, the adoption of a plan requires a firm commitment to its execution by those in authority, but the planning for implementation should involve those who are directly engaged in the educational processes at the institutions. During the planning period, there should be a movement from the legal/political administrative context to an educational context.

Open lines of communication must be maintained both internally and externally. The length of the planning process implies considerable risk of

rumors that may undermine or deter the planning process itself. In all three of the locations studied, the matter of communications was found to be of paramount importance. Rumors appeared in the community at large, in the press, and at the same time permeated faculty and student discussions. A systematic procedure for providing communication proved helpful at each site.

Providing a substantial period of time (possibly one year or more) between the adoption of a plan and the date for its actual initiation proves to be important in attaining the objectives of the plan. Institutional research is often needed to provide such data as enrollments by departments, productivity of instructional programs, and other trend information. Also, time is a vital factor in resolving conflicts which may arise as plans become increasingly specific. There was evidence at all three sites that many of these difficulties are resolved when time is available and attention is centered upon the ultimate objectives.

The ultimate outcomes of these three cases will be of significance in two ways. First, how successfully has each contributed to the enhancement of desegregation in public postsecondary education? Second, and in some ways more important, what effects has each had on the quality of higher education provided for the constituencies being served?

We have no previous experience with merger of an historically white and an historically black public university. Such a merger is not likely to occur on a voluntary basis. Most mergers in higher education seem to have resulted from urgent necessities, such as decline in enrollments and financial

difficulties. Will the outcomes in Nashville develop in ways which alleviate some of the apprehensions about merger? A key factor may be whether or not the merged institution is able to fulfill the commitment to serve the total community while retaining to a visible degree historic roots and traditions.

A key issue in Savannah is whether a major division of instruction, such as teacher education, can be removed from an institution without weakening its position as a full-service college. Teacher education is regarded as an institution-wide enterprise, not limited only to courses in education. Its removal, therefore, will have consequences on other curricular offerings. Perhaps to a lesser degree, the removal of business administration may have similar effects upon related disciplines.

In Norfolk, a basic question is whether or not interinstitutional planning and cooperation prove not only to be acceptable but to constitute a positive arrangement which strengthens both institutions. Unless the latter perception emerges, support of the plan will lessen over a period of time.

The concluding observation is that the influence of legal and political and governmental forces must decrease and the influence of educational institutions and programs increase during the planning period. To bring about changes dictated by public policy, the authority of outside forces must be loosened and effectively transformed into institutional forces which can actively produce the changes desired.

THE CONTRIBUTORS

CAMERON L. FINCHER is director of the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia. After receiving his doctorate from Ohio State University, he served for nine years as director of testing and counseling at Georgia State University. In addition to participating in a number of programs conducted by SREB, he has conducted studies for the Georgia Board of Regents and served on committees of other state agencies. He is a licensed applied psychologist and is a member of the faculty in psychology at the University of Georgia.

JAMES M. GODARD joined the SREB staff in 1966, where his work is primarily related to SREB's Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity. He has been the academic dean of a liberal arts college and a vice president of a comprehensive university. For six years he headed the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Commission on Colleges and Universities, and in that capacity made campus visits to most of the historically black colleges in the South. He has kept abreast of developments in the desegregation of public postsecondary education in the South, frequently providing consultation services to state agencies and to institutions.

ANNE S. PRUITT is associate dean of the Graduate School at Ohio State University. She is a graduate in psychology of Howard University with graduate degrees from Columbia University. Her experiences include serving as dean of students at Albany State College and at Fisk University and on the faculty of Case-Western Reserve University. She has been a consultant to SREB a number of times and is the author of the SREB publication, New Students and Coordinated Counseling. In 1977 she was an American Council on Education Fellow. She has been a national leader in the field of student personnel administration and is currently a member of the Advisory Committee to the U. S. Coast Guard Academy.

PRINCE E. WILSON is executive assistant to the president of Atlanta University. Prior to that position he served for many years as executive secretary to the Atlanta University Center. He took his undergraduate work at Talladega College and received his graduate degrees from the University of Chicago. He has served on the staff of historically black and historically white universities and directed training programs for teachers of the disadvantaged from Alaska to California and Puerto Rico where he worked with all types of ethnic groups. He has frequently participated in SREB activities.